BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

CARL J. KUNASEK
CHAIRMAN
JIM IRVIN
COMMISSIONER
RENZ D. JENNINGS
COMMISSIONER

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF MCIMETRO ACCESS TRANSMISSION SERVICES, INC. FOR ARBITRATION OF INTERCONNECTION RATES, TERMS AND CONDITIONS PURSUANT TO 47 U.S.C. § 252(b) OF THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996.	DOCKET NO. U-3175-96-479 DOCKET NO. E-1051-96-479 **SUPPLEMENTAL CITATION OF AUTHORITIES**

U S WEST Communications, Inc. ("U S WEST") submits: (1) Order Dismissing Complaints dated July 29, 1997 filed with the State of Iowa Department of Commerce Utilities Board and (2) Opinion and Order dated July 31, 1997 filed with the Michigan Public Service Commission as supplemental authorities supporting its motion to dismiss.

DATED this 27th day of October, 1997.

U S WEST LAW DEPARTMENT
William M. Ojile, Jr.
1801 California Street, Suite 5100
Denver, Colorado 80202
(303) 672-2720

and

FENNEMORE CRAIG

By _____
Timothy Berg
Theresa Dwyer
3003 N. Central Avenue
Suite 2600
Phoenix, AZ 85012
Attorneys for
U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

ORIGINAL and 10 copies of the foregoing filed this 27th day of October, 1997, with:

Arizona Corporation Commission
Docket Control
1200 West Washington Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85005

Four copies of the foregoing hand delivered this 27th day of October, 1997, to:

Arizona Corporation Commission
Hearing Division - Arbitration
1200 West Washington Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85005

Christopher Kempley
Assistant Chief Counsel
Legal Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Carl Dabelstein, Director
Utilities Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

COPY of the foregoing hand delivered and faxed this 27th day of October, 1997, to:

Thomas H. Campbell
LEWIS & ROCA
40 North Central Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85003
Attorneys for MCImetro Access Transmission Services, Inc.

PHX/TBERG/793743.1/67817.097

STATE OF IOWA

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

UTILITIES BOARD

IN RE: MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION, Petitioner, v. U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC., Respondent.	DOCKET NO. FCU-97-2
AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF THE MIDWEST, INC., Petitioner, v. U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC., and GTE MIDWEST INCORPORATED, Respondents.	DOCKET NO. FCU-97-3

ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINTS

(Issued July 29, 1997)

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On April 15, 1997, MCI Telecommunications Corporation (MCI) filed a complaint with the Utilities Board (Board), identified as Docket No. FCU-97-2,

alleging the intrastate access charges of U S West Communications, Inc. (U S West), are excessive and unduly discriminate against interexchange carriers. On May 14, 1997, AT&T Communications of the Midwest, Inc. (AT&T), filed a similar complaint, identified as Docket No. FCU-97-3, against U S West and GTE Midwest Incorporated (GTE). The complaints ask the Board to reduce the amounts charged by U S West and GTE for intrastate access.

U S West filed motions to dismiss each complaint. The Consumer Advocate Division of the Department of Justice (Consumer Advocate) filed separate responses to each complaint stating there are no reasonable grounds to institute formal complaint proceedings and, therefore, the complaints should be rejected. GTE filed a motion to dismiss the complaint filed in Docket No. FCU-97-3.

AT&T filed a motion to consolidate the two dockets. GTE objected to the consolidation, arguing the factual circumstances between the two complaints are different because U S West is a rate-regulated utility while GTE is price regulated pursuant to IOWA CODE § 476.97 (1997). Because U S West and GTE are both named respondents to the complaint filed by AT&T, the Board will treat the dockets as being consolidated for purposes of ruling on the motions to dismiss.

SUMMARY OF PARTIES' POSITIONS

The complaints, taken together, allege intrastate switched access rates charged by U S West and GTE are unreasonable and in violation of IOWA CODE §

476.3 (1997). MCI and AT&T argue the rates for these services should be reduced to "economic cost," which they define as the cost that an efficient, competitive firm would incur to produce a good or service. MCI and AT&T claim competition in long distance markets will be promoted if access charges are reduced.

Addressing specifically the complaint against GTE, both GTE and Consumer Advocate argue because GTE is price regulated, price changes can be mandated only by application of the statutory formula. IOWA CODE § 476.97 (1997). The parties note during the period of price regulation, Consumer Advocate is prohibited from filing a petition alleging excessive rates. IOWA CODE § 476.3(2) (1997).

Consumer Advocate, U S West, and GTE argue the complaints are a clear attempt to involve the Board in "piece-meal" rate making. U S West also claims the complaints are premature because the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has been reviewing the entire system of interstate access charges and universal service. In addition, U S West notes the Board has a pending proceeding examining universal service issues.

DISCUSSION

GTE

GTE is no longer rate regulated but is price regulated. During the time GTE is under price regulation, it appears the only mandated reductions are those required pursuant to the statutory formula. IOWA CODE § 476.97 (1997). The complaint

against GTE is an attempt to circumvent the statutory mandates of price regulation by requiring even greater reductions and will be dismissed.

U S WEST

U S West is a rate regulated public utility under chapter 476 and the complaint requests U S West's rates be considered in a piece-meal fashion. The Board generally disapproves of "piece-meal" rate making. In determining whether a rate-regulated utility's rates are "just and reasonable," the Board examines a utility's revenues and costs in their entirety, not just isolated issues selected by the utility or another party to achieve a desired result. If a utility, or any other party, has the ability to force review of rates on selected issues, the Board would be inundated with limited rate cases focusing upon just those issues that would either increase or decrease rates without the ability to review the rates in the context of all revenues and costs. Such limited rate cases are not a productive use of the Board's, or Consumer Advocate's, resources. In addition, there needs to be some finality to the Board's determination of the reasonableness of rates.

While the Board has under certain limited conditions engaged in piece-meal rate making, this request does not make a case as an exception to the general prohibition. See Office of Consumer Advocate v. Iowa State Commerce Comm'n, 465 N.W.2d 280, 282 (Iowa 1991) (lists four conditions which a piece-meal rate making request must generally meet). Access service is one of the basic telephone services, and the revenue impact, alleged to be in excess of $20 million, is not

insignificant. In addition, there is no allegation the complaints were prompted by any cost reduction beyond U S West's control. Finally, the Board believes a determination of whether a rate for a basic service is just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory should be made in a full rate proceeding where a utility's entire cost structure and rate design are examined.

The Board understands the industry is in a time of transition and many of the traditional rate-making concepts are either inapplicable or are under review. However, U S West remains a rate-regulated entity and until that fact changes or the legislature authorizes a different approach, the regulatory principles must be applied. Access charges cannot be considered outside the context of a full rate review.

After examining the complaints, motions to dismiss, and all other pleadings and documents contained in the record of Docket Nos. FCU-97-2 and FCU-97-3, the Board finds there are no reasonable grounds to conduct further investigations of U S West's and GTE's access rates. See IOWA CODE § 476.3(1) (1997). The complaints will be dismissed.

ORDERING CLAUSES

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED:

1. The motions to dismiss or reject complaints filed in Docket Nos. FCU-97-2 and FCU-97-3 by U S West Communications, Inc., GTE Midwest Incorporated, and the Consumer Advocate Division of the Department of Justice are granted.

2. The complaints filed in Docket Nos. FCU-97-2 and FCU-97-3 are dismissed.

UTILITIES BOARD

ATTEST:

Executive Secretary

Dated at Des Moines, Iowa, this 29th day of July, 1997.

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

In the matter of the application and complaint filed by MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION requesting a reduction in AMERITECH MICHIGAN's intrastate switched access charges.	Case No. U-11366

At the July 31, 1997 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing, Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. John G. Strand, Chairman
Hon. John C. Shea, Commissioner
Hon. David A. Svanda, Commissioner

OPINION AND ORDER

I.

HISTORY OF PROCEEDINGS

On April 15, 1997, MCI Telecommunications Corporation (MCI) filed an application and complaint (complaint) in an effort to obtain a reduction in Ameritech Michigan's intrastate switched access charges to a level equivalent to the total service long run incremental cost (TSLRIC) and a reasonable share of forward looking, economic shared and common costs.

On April 16, 1997, the complaint was served on Ameritech Michigan.

Pursuant to due notice, a prehearing conference was conducted on May 2, 1997 before Administrative Law Judge Daniel E. Nickerson, Jr., (ALJ). At the prehearing conference, petitions for leave to intervene filed by AT&T Communications of Michigan, Inc., (AT&T) and Attorney General Frank J. Kelley (Attorney General) were granted. The prehearing conference was also attended by representatives of MCI, Ameritech Michigan, and the Commission Staff (Staff).

On May 9, 1997, the ALJ conducted a hearing to address the merits of a motion filed by Ameritech Michigan that sought dismissal of MCI's complaint.

On May 20, 1997, the ALJ issued a Proposal for Decision (PFD) that recommended that MCI's complaint be dismissed. Exceptions to the PFD were filed by MCI, AT&T, and the Attorney General. A reply to exceptions was filed by Ameritech Michigan.[1]

II.

POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

In support of its motion to dismiss, Ameritech Michigan argued that, given the Commission's past rulings on access charges, the subject matter of MCI's complaint is premature. Because the Michigan Telecommunications Act (MTA), 1991 PA 179, as amended by 1995 PA 216, MCL 484.2101 et seq.; MSA 22.1469(101) et seq., permits Ameritech Michigan until January 1, 2000 to phase in the restructuring of its rates, it maintained that MCI's complaint is not appropriate for the wholesale review and reduction of Ameritech Michigan's intrastate switched access charges. Ameritech Michigan also contended that its access charges are both lawful and reasonable because they mirror rates that have been approved by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) for interstate access.

In response, MCI argued that Ameritech Michigan should not be permitted to block an evidentiary hearing to determine whether Ameritech Michigan's access charges should be reduced. According to MCI, Ameritech Michigan has not shown that MCI's complaint raises no genuine issue of material fact or fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted. Further, MCI argued that its complaint satisfies the requirements of Section 310(2) of MTA, which specifically authorizes a provider to seek a determination from the Commission in the event that an agreement

---

[1] On July 11, 1997, AT&T and MCI filed a joint motion seeking resumption of the contested case hearing. On July 18, 1 ritech Michigan filed a response to the joint motion. Because the relief requested in the joint motion filed by AT&T and M icated entirely on a statutory provision concerning the Commission's authority to promulgate uniform filing standards that ted by 1995 PA 216, the Commission finds that the arguments contained in joint motion have no merit.

cannot be reached regarding the appropriate level of an access rate. Additionally, MCI maintained that it is only seeking a reduction of Ameritech Michigan's access rates to a reasonable level, not a restructuring of such rates pursuant to Section 304a of the MTA. Finally, MCI argued that the Commission should not defer determination of the issues presented by its complaint pending the FCC's review of interstate access rates, as requested by Ameritech Michigan.

AT&T and the Attorney General supported MCI's position that Ameritech Michigan's motion to dismiss should not be granted. The Staff took no position on the issue.

III.

PROPOSAL FOR DECISION

In his PFD, the ALJ agreed with Ameritech Michigan that the issues raised by MCI's complaint are premature. Citing the Commission's December 7, 1995 order in Case No. U-10852 and the May 10, 1996 order in Case No. U-11039, the ALJ concluded that the issues raised by MCI's complaint will not be ripe until Ameritech Michigan completes its rate restructuring, which must be finalized prior to January 1, 2000.

IV.

EXCEPTIONS

In their exceptions, MCI, AT&T, and the Attorney General argue that Ameritech Michigan's motion to dismiss should not be granted.[2] MCI maintains that the ALJ's determination that dismissal of its complaint is required by Section 304a is inconsistent with three other sections of the MTA. According to MCI, Section 204 of the MTA provides for the Commission to resolve disputes between providers regarding regulated telecommunication issues. Additionally, MCI stresses that Section 205(2) allows the Commission to require changes in how a telecommunication service is provided if it finds that the conditions for the service violate the MTA or are adverse to

[2] The Staff did not file any exceptions to the PFD.

the public interest. Finally, MCI points out that Section 310(2) explicitly allows a provider to apply to the Commission in the event that it has an irreconcilable dispute with another provider regarding an access rate.

MCI also argues that the rationale of the Commission's December 7, 1995 order in Case No. U-10852, which involved an effort by AT&T to reduce Ameritech Michigan's intrastate access charges, does not support the PFD. According to MCI, Ameritech Michigan's position in Case No. U-10852 constitutes the first round of a continuing shell game designed by Ameritech Michigan to solidify its incumbent monopolist position. Moreover, MCI insists that any similarity between the issues presented by this case and those raised in Case No. U-10852 should not preclude MCI from having the right to present evidence in support of its allegations that Ameritech Michigan's access charges are excessive and should be reduced. MCI stresses that the telecommunication industry is rapidly evolving and that the evidentiary record presented in Case No. U-10852 contained none of the information from Ameritech Michigan's initial restructuring (Case No. U-11039) or Ameritech Michigan's most recent TSLRIC proceeding (Case No. U-11280).

Additionally, MCI maintains that, because there is no requirement that Michigan's intrastate access rates mirror the FCC's interstate access rates, there is simply no justification for the PFD's suggestion that the Commission defer action on MCI's complaint until the FCC completes its pending review of interstate access rates. Indeed, MCI suggests that the time has arrived for the Commission to end the practice of establishing intrastate access rates through the mirroring of interstate rates.

Finally, MCI argues that its complaint is unrelated to and should not be controlled by Ameritech Michigan's rate restructuring activities. MCI insists that the sole focus of this proceeding is Ameritech Michigan's access rates. Accordingly, MCI contends that Ameritech Michigan's Section 304a authority to take until January 1, 2000 to restructure its rates does not support the dismissal of the complaint.

Citing R 460.17513 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rule 513), AT&T insists that Ameritech Michigan has failed to establish any of the four grounds for granting a motion to dismiss. AT&T points out that Ameritech Michigan did not challenge MCI's standing to request a reduction in access charges and has not questioned the Commission's jurisdiction to grant such a request. Further, AT&T insists that even a cursory review of MCI's complaint clearly reveals that MCI has stated a prima facie case upon which relief can be granted and that it has complied with the Commission's rules regarding the content of formal complaints. Accordingly, AT&T insists that Ameritech Michigan's motion to dismiss should be rejected because none of the four bases for dismissal under Rule 513 are applicable to this case.

AT&T also argues that the ALJ's decision to rely on R 460.17323 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rule 323) as a basis for dismissing MCI's complaint should be rejected. According to AT&T, the PFD clearly focuses its recommendation upon policy reasons that are grounded upon prior Commission rulings, rather than on whether MCI's complaint states a claim upon which relief can be granted. AT&T maintains that nothing in the Commission's December 7, 1995 order in Case No. U-10852 should preclude MCI from challenging the unreasonableness of Ameritech Michigan's access rates. Further, arguing that it has been demonstrated in Case No. U-11280 that all of Ameritech Michigan's services are currently priced above their corresponding TSLRIC, further restructuring of Ameritech Michigan's rates pursuant to Section 304a of the MTA is now moot. In any event, AT&T insists that MCI should have the right to bring its access rate dispute to the Commission's attention pursuant to Section 310 of the MTA regardless of the status of Ameritech Michigan's restructuring of rates pursuant to Section 304a. Finally, AT&T supports MCI's contention that access rate revision in Michigan should not be delayed by the FCC's ongoing restructuring of interstate access rates.

The Attorney General argues that the ALJ erred in concluding that Ameritech Michigan's authority to restructure its rates pursuant to Section 304a constitutes a basis for the summary dismissal of MCI's complaint. According to the Attorney General, the issues raised by MCI's

complaint are ripe for timely consideration by the Commission and clearly involve a claim upon which relief may be granted. Moreover, he insists that the FCC's efforts to reform interstate access rates do not preclude the Commission's review of MCI's complaint. Accordingly, the Attorney General contends that this proceeding should go forward so that the majority of the telecommunication customers in this state will have an opportunity to obtain relief from the payment of unnecessarily high intrastate access charges.

V.

REPLY TO EXCEPTIONS

Ameritech Michigan contends that the ALJ properly recommended that MCI's complaint be dismissed. Ameritech Michigan asserts that MCI has conveniently overlooked Section 205 of the MTA, which provides the Commission with discretion to simply dismiss any complaint that it finds does not merit further investigation or an evidentiary hearing. Indeed, Ameritech Michigan argues that if the Legislature intended to give a party an absolute right to have its complaint resolved by the Commission, it would have drafted Section 205 with mandatory, not permissive, language.

Ameritech Michigan also contends that MCI's complaint is tantamount to a request that Ameritech Michigan's access rates be reduced in a fashion that clearly amounts to a Section 304a rate restructuring. Because Section 304a explicitly grants Ameritech Michigan until January 1, 2000 to determine how and when each of its rates will be restructured, Ameritech Michigan asserts that the ALJ properly dismissed MCI's complaint. While acknowledging that an application for resolution of an isolated rate dispute that is filed pursuant to Section 310(2) would be appropriate in a situation where two providers cannot agree on a single rate, Ameritech Michigan argues that Section 304a governs any proceeding designed to bring about a sweeping restructuring of access rates. Accordingly, Ameritech Michigan insists that MCI should not be permitted to circumvent the rate restructuring provisions embodied in Section 304a by arguing that its attempt to bring about a complete restructuring of Ameritech Michigan's access rates is covered by Section 310(2).

Ameritech Michigan also maintains that the ALJ properly relied on the December 7, 1995 order in Case No. U-10852 in recommending dismissal of MCI's complaint. According to Ameritech Michigan, the Commission's decision in Case No. U-10852, which dismissed a complaint by AT&T to reduce Ameritech Michigan's access rates, completely supports the recommendation in the PFD. Moreover, given the recent FCC action regarding interstate access reform and the restructuring of access charges that will result from the FCC's May 7, 1997 order,[3] Ameritech Michigan argues that it would be entirely appropriate for the Commission to await completion of the FCC's restructuring efforts before entertaining MCI's complaint.

Further, while acknowledging that there is no requirement that its intrastate access rates must mirror the FCC's interstate access rates, Ameritech Michigan nevertheless stresses that the Commission's May 28, 1986 order in Cases Nos. U-8083, U-8084, and U-8085 cited several reasons why the mirroring of federal rates was reasonable. Because the Commission previously determined that the mirroring of access rates is reasonable, Ameritech Michigan asserts that it is important for the Commission to understand what the FCC is doing at the federal level before ordering changes in access rates at the state level. Indeed, Ameritech Michigan argues that interstate and intrastate telecommunication services do not exist in isolation and that many of the same facilities are used and that the same costs are incurred to provide access. Moreover, if this matter were allowed to proceed, Ameritech Michigan insists that the parties would likely be required to refile testimony and to relitigate issues every time more information comes available from the FCC. Further, according to Ameritech Michigan, if the Commission does not await completion of the FCC's restructuring of interstate access rates, any changes ordered by the Commission would probably be in effect for only one or two months before the sweeping reforms being implemented at the federal level become effective. Accordingly, Ameritech Michigan insists that the ALJ properly determined that going forward with MCI's complaint at this time would amount

---

First Report and Order, CC Dockets Nos. 96-262, 94-1, 91-213, and 95-72, (FCC 97-158) May 7, 1997.

to a waste of everyone's time and resources.

VI.

DISCUSSION

The Commission finds that the issues presented by MCI's complaint should not be addressed at this time. Michigan's statutory scheme regarding the establishment of access charges is quite clear. The initial responsibility for determining intrastate access rates lies with the provider of such services. MCL 484.2310(2); MSA 22.1469(310)(2). In setting access rates, the provider must adhere to two statutory restrictions. First, intrastate access rates shall not exceed interstate access rates approved by the FCC. MCL 484.2310(2); MSA 22.1469(310)(2). Second, access rates shall not be less than the provider's TSLRIC by January 1, 2000. MCL 484.2304a; MSA 22.1469(304a). However, by agreement of two or more providers, an access rate may be set at a level that is less than the rate allowed by the FCC. MCL 484.2310(2); MSA 22.1469(310)(2). Only if an agreement cannot be reached on a rate, may a provider apply to the Commission pursuant to Section 204 of the MTA for a determination of the appropriate rate. MCL 484.2310(2); MSA 22.1469(310)(2).

MCI's complaint alleges that, despite the fact that Ameritech Michigan's intrastate access rates do not exceed federally approved access rates in accordance with MCL 484.2310(2); MSA 22.1469(310)(2), they are nonetheless unreasonable and excessive. The Commission recognizes that there is room under Sections 204, 205(2), and 310(2) of the MTA for MCI to argue that Ameritech Michigan's access rates are too high. However, the Commission agrees with the ALJ and Ameritech Michigan that it is not appropriate at this time to address MCI's contentions.

In its December 7, 1995 order in Case No. U-10852, the Commission concluded that it would be prudent to await Ameritech Michigan's restructuring before considering a similar request by AT&T to order reductions in access rates below federally-mirrored tariffs. Moreover, in its May 10, 1996 order in Case No. U-11039, which approved Ameritech Michigan's rate restructuring

application for its basic local exchange services, the Commission found that, through passage of Section 304a of the MTA, the Legislature had authorized Ameritech Michigan to determine when its access rates would be restructured, although such rate restructuring must be completed by January 1, 2000.

It is also well established that the FCC is currently in the process of revamping interstate access rates. In so doing, the FCC has indicated that it intends to "eliminate some of the distortions that have characterized the access charge system for over a decade." FCC, 97-158, ¶ 42. Further, in ordering substantial reductions in the charges for usage-rated interstate access services, the FCC stated that its actions would move access charges "a long way towards their forward-looking cost levels." FCC, 97-158, ¶ 43.

In determining that it should reduce usage sensitive interstate access charges by phasing out local loop and other nontraffic sensitive (NTS) costs from those charges and by directing incumbent local exchange carriers to recover those NTS costs through more economically effective, flat-rated charges, the FCC also indicated that it would rely on emerging competition in local telecommunication markets due to the present unavailability of accurate forward-looking models for determining the economic cost of providing access service.[4]

Accordingly, the Commission is persuaded that it is both prudent and consistent with the intent of the MTA to defer consideration of the issues raised by MCI's complaint until the effects of Ameritech Michigan's Section 304a rate restructuring, the FCC's access rate initiative, and the emergence of competition in the local telecommunication market place are better understood. Because Ameritech Michigan is required by MCL 484.2310(2); MSA 22.1469(310)(2) to reduce its intrastate access rates to the extent that the FCC determines interstate access rates should be reduced, any delay in considering the issues raised in MCI's complaint will be mitigated by reductions in intrastate access rates required by the MTA. Therefore, the Commission concludes

---

Due to the existence of significant joint and common costs, the FCC believed that the development of a reliable cost model c a year or more to complete. FCC 97-158, ¶ 45.

that MCI's complaint should be dismissed.

The Commission FINDS that:

a. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 1991 PA 179, as amended by 1995 PA 216, MCL 484.2101 et seq.; MSA 22.1469(101) et seq.; 1969 PA 306, as amended, MCL 24.201 et seq.; MSA 3.560(101) et seq.; and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, as amended, 1992 AACS, R 460.17101 et seq.

b. MCI's complaint should be dismissed.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the application and complaint filed by MCI Telecommunications Corporation requesting a reduction in Ameritech Michigan's intrastate switched access charges is dismissed.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26; MSA 22.45.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

/s/ John G. Strand
Chairman

(SEAL)

/s/ John C. Shea
Commissioner

/s/ David A. Svanda
Commissioner

By its action of July 31, 1997.

/s/ Dorothy Wideman
Its Executive Secretary

b. MCI's complaint should be dismissed.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the application and complaint filed by MCI Telecommunications Corporation requesting a reduction in Ameritech Michigan's intrastate switched access charges is dismissed.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26; MSA 22.45.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

_____
Chairman

_____
Commissioner

_____
Commissioner

By its action of July 31, 1997.

_____
Its Executive Secretary

In the matter of the application and complaint filed by MCI TELECOMMUNICATIONS CORPORATION requesting a reduction in AMERITECH MICHIGAN's intrastate switched access charges.

Case No. U-11366

Suggested Minute:

"Adopt and issue order dated July 31, 1997 dismissing the complaint filed by MCI Telecommunications Corporation requesting a reduction in Ameritech Michigan's intrastate switched access charges, as set forth in the order."